

Stockton on Tees Borough Council

Supplementary Planning Document: Housing and Supplementary Planning Document: Householder Extensions and Alterations

Consultation Statement

Including Community Impact Assessment Update and Review of The Environmental
Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004
Part 9 Determination of Likely Significant Environmental Effects
Determination and Statement of Reasons under Part 9 (1) and (3)

May 2021

Introduction

1. The purpose of this statement is to provide details about the consultation which has taken place during the production of draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD): Housing and draft Supplementary Planning Document: Householder Extensions and Alterations and the following supporting documents:
 - Strategic Environmental Assessment Consultation Screening Report,
 - Strategic Environmental Assessment Determination and Statement,
 - Community Impact Assessment for SPD1: Housing,
 - Community Impact Assessment for SPD2: Householder Extensions and Alterations.
2. SPD1: Housing will replace SPD8: Affordable Housing (2014) and the High Density Development: Flats and Apartments Supplementary Planning Guidance (2005). SPD2: Householder Extensions and Alterations will replace Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 2: Householder Extension Guide (2004).
3. Regulation 12 of the 2012 Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) Regulations requires that before a Local Planning Authority adopt an SPD it must:

Prepare a statement setting out:

- the persons the LPA consulted when preparing the SPD;
 - a summary of the main issues raised by those persons; and
 - how those issues have been addressed in the SPD.
- when seeking representations, copies of the statement must be made available with the Draft Document when it is published.
4. In accordance with the relevant regulations, the draft SPDs and supporting documents were subject to a SEA screening consultation and also a public consultation. This Consultation Statement sets out how this was undertaken, the comments which were received and what changes have been made to the document as a result. A Consultation Plan is included at Appendix A which sets out the Council's approach to this consultation.

SEA Screening Consultation

5. Under Regulation 9 (2) of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004, the preliminary SEA Screening Report was forwarded to the 'Consultation Bodies' – the Environment Agency, Natural England and Historic England for comment on content and conclusion. The responses received from Natural England and the Environment Agency confirmed the Council's conclusions at Stage 3. Historic England however were unable to respond, due to the lack of staff resources. In view of this, the Council's Historic Buildings Officer provided advice, agreeing with those conclusions.
6. Therefore, Stockton on Tees Borough Council determined that the Draft Supplementary Planning Document: Housing and Draft Supplementary Planning Document: Householder Extensions and Alterations are not likely to have significant environmental effects. Accordingly, it is considered that an environmental assessment of the SPDs is not required. An update following the consultation is included in Appendix C.

Public Consultation Period

7. The Council made the draft SPDs and supporting documents available in accordance with Regulation 12, 13 and 35 of the 2012 Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) Regulations and invited members of the public, relevant authorities, general consultation bodies, specific consultations bodies, duty-to cooperate partners, and any other interested party on the Council's Local Plan Consultation Database to make comments on the documents.

8. The consultation period ran from Wednesday 8th January 2020 to 5pm on Wednesday 5th February 2020. Consultees were encouraged to make representations on the response form available on the Council's website. Paper and email representations were also accepted.
9. During the consultation, the following steps were undertaken -
 - Copies of the draft SPDs and supporting documents were made available during normal office hours at the Council's Planning Office at:

Municipal Buildings
Church Road
Stockton on Tees
TS18 1LD
 - Copies of the draft SPDs and supporting documents were also made available at all libraries within the Borough.
 - Copies of the draft SPDs and supporting documents and details of all locations were also made available on the Council's website.
10. In addition, letters and emails were sent to organisations and individuals included on the Council's Local Plan Consultation Database informing them of the consultation period, the locations where the documents were available to view and the procedure for making comments. A list of the main organisations consulted is included at Appendix D.

Comments Received

1. A total of 13 responses were received in regards to SPD: Housing. A schedule of the comments received and the Council's response is included at Appendix B.
2. A total of 6 responses were received regarding SPD: Householder Extensions and Alterations during the consultation; however, the majority of these stated that the organisations responding had no specific comments to make regarding the SPD. A schedule of the comments received, and the Council's response is included at Appendix B.

Appendix A – Consultation Plan

STOCKTON-ON-TEES BOROUGH COUNCIL

CONSULTATION PLAN FOR THE DRAFT SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT: HOUSING AND DRAFT SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT: HOUSEHOLDER EXTENSIONS AND ALTERATIONS

Consultation Period

Wednesday 8th January 2020 to Wednesday 5th February 2020 (4 weeks)

Statutory Requirements

To fulfil the requirements of:

- The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012
- The Stockton-on-Tees Statement of Community Involvement (2016)

Approach to consultation

To ensure a transparent and holistic consultation the Council propose the following approach to consultation which meets statutory requirements.

How will decisions be made and what feedback will be given?

The Council's approach to this is detailed within the Statement of Community Involvement.

Brief description of activity	Date	Who is involved?	What are the expected outcomes?
Council Members Drop In Session – inviting council members to drop in session.	Wednesday 15 th January 2020 at 5.00pm to 6.30pm in Jim Cooke Conference Suite.	Council Members	Awareness Raising
Publish SPDs and Supporting Documents on website- Consultation page and Economic Strategy and Spatial Planning section of SBC website	Wednesday 8 th January 2020.	Economic Strategy & Planning Policy Team to send documents to Communications Team to upload	Awareness Raising Detailed responses at both the strategic and local level
Use of corporate Facebook and Twitter accounts- to publicise consultation	Throughout consultation period as appropriate	Communications Team	Awareness Raising Detailed responses at the local level through response form
Letter/email to those on Consultation Database- stating where documentation is available. Those included on the Local Plan consultation database will be sent an e-mail/letter.	Letters sent on Tuesday 7 th January 2020. Email sent on Wednesday 8 th January 2020.	General and specific consultation bodies and duty to co-operate bodies as detailed within regulations. This includes local residents, local voluntary/community sector organisations, local businesses, and national organisations/agencies	Awareness Raising Detailed responses at both the strategic and local level
E-mail to chair of Locality Forums- stating where documentation is available	Wednesday 8 th January 2020.	Forum members and Economic Strategy & Planning Policy Team	Awareness Raising Detailed responses at a local level through response form
Email to all Council Members- stating where documentation is available.	Wednesday 8 th January 2020.	All Council Members to alert them of the consultation and also to allow them to publicise it where it affects residents in their ward.	Awareness Raising Detailed responses at both the strategic and local level
Make available within libraries and customer service centres/principal	Throughout consultation period	Library Service	Awareness Raising

Brief description of activity	Date	Who is involved?	What are the expected outcomes?
office			Detailed responses at a local level through response form
Awareness raising via Catalyst	During consultation- notice in Catalyst E-Bulletin.	Economic Strategy & Planning Policy Team, Catalyst, voluntary, community and social enterprise (VCSE) sector	Awareness Raising Detailed comments at local level from the voluntary, community and social enterprise (VCSE) sector through response form
Attendance at meetings of groups	Subject to interest	Interested group would be required to provide a formal invitation to the Council. Officers will consider attendance on basis of ability of group to attend existing drop-in sessions and staff resources.	Awareness Raising Detailed responses at both the strategic and local level

Appendix B – Schedule of Comments and Council Response Tables

SPD1: Housing		
Person/Organisation	Comment	Council Response
Matt Verlander/Avison Young on behalf of National Grid	No comments	Noted.
Cllr Louise Baldock/Stockton on Tees Borough Council	Section 13 (accessible and adaptable homes) should be strengthened. These figures are a minimum and the 'encourage you to come forward with percentages higher' than these % for accessible and adaptable homes 'would be particularly welcome.	The percentages for accessible and adaptable home are set by Local Plan policy H4. However, developers can be encouraged to provide for a higher proportion. A sentence will be added setting out that the percentages are not a maximum and developers can provide more.
Carla Wright/Natural England	No comments	Noted
Emma Sharpe/Historic England	No comments	Noted
Richard Holland/Persimmon	Sets out that Policy H4 of the Local Plan requires 8% of all new dwellings to meet M4(3), and that this has been taken forward in the SPD, and requests caution and flexibility in the rigid application of this policy. The concerns are raised, as at Local Plan Examination, around site and plan wide viability. A flexible approach or consideration of this policy is required to avoid a disproportionate impact on viability. Suggests an addition to paragraph 13.13 which reads: "Through consultation with the Local Authority it may be possible for applicants to agree a proportionate increase in provision for M4(2) provision in lieu of provision of M4(3), such instances will be treated on a case by case basis."	The approach of the SPD reflects point 9 b. of policy H4. Point 9 also sets out those instances where considerations might indicate a deviation from the Standards, and that includes site viability. There is no justification to include the suggested sentence. No proposed change.
Caitlin Newby/Environment Agency	No Comments	Noted
Paul Mackings/Cameron Hall	Objection raised to the revised off-site affordable housing calculations in Section 8. Argues that the level of financial contribution should be calculated to reflect the difference between the RSL purchase price and the open market value/recent sale price of housing in the locality that the affordable housing is to be provided. Questions whether the identified market home (for value) are on site or where the homes are to be provided. Supports the current calculation, the use of average house price and see no reason for change.	The approach in the SPD reflects adopted Policy H4.6, which states that where off-site affordable housing or a commuted sum is considered acceptable, the amount will be equivalent in value to that which would have been viable if the provision was made on-site and calculated with regard to Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document 8 and any successor. Viability matters are fully informed by formal assessment and subsequent negotiations are carried out on a case by

	The change will make housing development sites less deliverable and potentially unviable.	case basis. For clarity amend paragraph 8.1 (renumbered as paragraph 7.1) to state that the value of market homes is equivalent to that of homes on development site.
Chris Ratcliff/Sembcorp	Paragraph 5.2 allows for departures from the Local Plan and in paragraph 5.10 that viability will be considered, an allowance for the cost of supporting infrastructure and/particularly the cost for remediation of brownfield sites (other than demolition costs) is hidden. This approach is undermined by reference to exceptional circumstances and it is not mentioned in the calculation of a Commuted Sum. Greater sympathy or emphasis is appropriate, for example to have a conversation with a developer where there is a complicated or expensive remediation. Sembcorp supports the need for an objectively justified deviation from policy.	Appendix B4 sets out the matters that a Viability Assessment is expected to address but is not intended to be exhaustive. Where supporting infrastructure or remediation has an impact on viability and deliverability, the Council expects that element to form part of assessment and discussions. No proposed change.
	Paragraph 10.5 onwards; questions whether the statement concerning the local lettings policy and certain of the direction to Registered Providers or agreed Alternative Provider in paragraphs 10.3 and 10.4 is applicable to the SPD. Questions whether this should be a matter for the developer. Preference expressed would be for the developer's obligation to cease at the timely delivery up of affordable housing to the RP in the agreed ratios and for the right tenures.	Noted. However, the Council considers that this information is of use to those with an interest in affordable homes. Preference for cessation of developer's obligation is noted. No proposed change.
Tetlow King Planning/Rentplus UK Ltd	Promotes the Rentplus route to affordable home ownership through affordable rented housing. States that the reference to 'intermediate' tenures should be deleted (in paragraphs 7.15-7.18) and reference made only to the four tenures in the framework's definition of affordable housing – which is set out in Figure 2 of the SPD.	The definition of affordable homes within the Glossary to the SPD reflects the four definitions in the Framework. The Council has defined Intermediate Tenure as homes for sale and rent provided above social rent, and that these can be shared equity [shared ownership and equity loans, other low-cost homes for sale and intermediate rent, but not affordable rented housing. Furthermore, the definition goes on to say that the intermediate tenures MUST fit within the definition of affordable housing. No proposed change.
	Paragraph 7.15 identifies a 70:30 split between affordable rented and 'intermediate' tenures and goes on to say that the starting point will be to secure 30% shared ownership. This should be expanded to include other affordable home ownership [products], in	The intent of paragraph 7.15 (renumbered as paragraph 6.15) onwards is not preclude entirely other products. Any alternatives to the Council's preferences however should be justified in evidence of how that product would meet and be secured to meet a local affordable housing need.

	accordance with the framework.	No proposed change.
	Paragraph 7.17 states that the Council is not intending to meet the 10% provision of affordable home ownership but are asked to consider the role of affordable rent to but in helping to achieve this percentage provision of affordable home ownership options in Stockton.	The intent of paragraph 7.15 (renumbered as paragraph 6.15) onwards is not preclude entirely other products. Any alternatives to the Council's preferences however should be justified in evidence of how that product would meet and be secured to meet a local affordable housing need. No proposed change.
Chris Smith/Lichfields on behalf of Story Homes	Paragraph 7.8. Agrees with the Council's support and encouragement attainment of the Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS), but comments that Local Plan Policy H4 does not impose a requirement to do so, and NDSS's should not be mandatory. Also notes that NDSS can impact on the viability of a scheme and impact upon the Council's wider S106 requirements.	Paragraph 7.8 (now paragraph 6.8) does not require NDSS but supports and encourages attainment of those standards. Comments regarding viability are noted. No proposed change.
	Paragraphs 7.15 – 7.18 – The Affordable Housing Tenure preferences refer to the Council's Strategic Housing Market Assessment and it is considered that this evidence is now out of date, and no justification to go against a clear direction from the NPPF which seeks to deliver homes for affordable ownership. There is no justification to dismiss the provision of Discounted Market Sale Homes (DMSH). Whilst the SPD seeks to stipulate conditions upon when the provision of DMSH would be acceptable, the requirement for 'robust evidence' is heavy handed, and this would normally be included in an Affordable Housing Statement.	The intent of paragraph 7.15 (renumbered as paragraph 6.15) onwards is not preclude entirely other products. Any alternatives to the Council's preferences however should be justified in evidence of how that product would address and be secured to meet a local affordable housing need. There is no requirement for 'robust evidence' in this instance, but robust procedures to ensure that the homes are available to those in need. The advice in paragraph 7.18 (now 6.18) reflects the Council's view that the housing market has not changed sufficiently to dismiss the findings of the SHMA. Paragraph Appendix B1 Housing Statement (rather than the Affordable Housing Statement) requires information regarding house tenures and types and how this reflects local needs and demands. No proposed change.
	Revise paragraphs 7.18-7.19 to place less emphasis on the SHMA and resisting affordable homeownership products. They should support the delivery of affordable homeownership and suggest that it should encourage discussions on the proposed housing mix based on the evidence available in an up to date SHMA, and sufficiently flexible to adapt to future updates of the evidence base.	Paragraphs 7.18 and 7.19 (now 6.18 and 6.19) around housing mix and tenure refers to evidence in the SHMA, but paragraph 7.21 goes on to say that an applicant can provide other evidentiary documents and surveys to support products. It is considered that there is enough flex to allow for consideration and provision of alternatives. No proposed change.
	Paragraphs 7.19 – 7.22 Housing Mix and Tenure should not be derived from the SHMA because it is out of date. Suggest a more flexible approach, and it would be more appropriate to review this section of the SPD to ensure	The guidance given in paragraphs 7.19 – 7.22 (now 6.19 – 6.22) reflects the approach in the Local Plan around housing mix and tenure and refers not only to the SHMA, but to the fact that 'there may be other acceptable sources

	that any referenced figures/mix is indicative and to encourage discussions on the proposed housing mix based upon evidence in an up to date SHMA.	of evidence'. Although the Council's preferred mix is given in Table 2, paragraph 7.20 (renumbered as paragraph 6.20) states that this is a starting point for negotiation and consideration of planning applications. Paragraph 7.21 (now 6.21) suggests that other evidentiary documents can be submitted in support of planning applications. It considered that the approach in those paragraphs allows for further information to be submitted including where an applicant is of the view that the SHMA is 'out of date'. No proposed change.
	Paragraphs 7.29 – 7.34 Off Site Affordable Housing appear to go beyond the requirements as set out in the Local Plan and it should be revised for consistency.	Agree and revise bullet points in Paragraph 7.30 (now 6.30) to reflect point 5 of Policy H4.
	Paragraph 11.4 Viability Assessments should be revised to refer to the Council's preference for key information to be agreed with the applicant, and that this be made publicly available. Also encourage applicants to work with the Council to produce versions of the documents that will be published online. Suggests the production of a standard key facts form which can be used to summarise key information from the viability assessment. This form could be made publicly available.	The basis of the approach is paragraph 11.4 (renumbered as paragraph 10.4) is to agree those matters that can be released to the public and those which are commercially sensitive. Agree that a less prescriptive approach would be appropriate. Amend paragraph 11.4 (now 10.4) to require agreement (with the Council) of sensitive information and for applicants to supply, for publication a redacted version of viability evidence.
	Paragraph 13.6 – 13.11 Accessible and Adaptable Homes: Compliance with M4(1) is a standard part of Building Regulations and inclusion in this section is not required.	Comment is noted but disagree and the reference to M4(1) is retained for completeness. No proposed change.
Oliver Lloyd/Gladman	Gladman reminds that SPDs are not an opportunity to set policy. It is to provide guidance on existing planning policy.	Noted. The SPD has not been drafted with the intention of setting new policy.
	Paragraphs 5.11 and 7.3 Affordable Housing Statements state that AHS should be submitted and approved by the Council before the development commences. Gladman considers that this requirement is not efficient and imposes time constraints on the development process.	Noted and Paragraph 5.11 leads on this matter. Agree that there may be instances where this is not possible, and this should be reflected in the paragraph. Amend relevant sentence to allow flexibility in this regard.
	It is inappropriate for Registered Providers to be provided alongside other Planning Obligations at the masterplan stage as suggested at Paragraph 5.12 Strategic and Large Major scale development	Agree and amend sentence in paragraph 5.12 to refer to supplying the details of Registered Providers where appropriate and available.
	Paragraph 7.3 states that an AHS requires details that	Paragraph 7.3 (now paragraph 6.3) and Appendix B2 sets

	<p>are not required at outline application stage and is not appropriate.</p>	<p>out that an AHS should be based on the approach and information requirements set out in the SPD and the Appendix, as appropriate. This gives flexibility around the detail required for determination based on the type of application. For clarity, insert sentence in Paragraph 7.3 (now 6.3) to allow for flexibility in the range and type of information to be submitted in each instance.</p>
	<p>Paragraph 7.6 sets out that development uses good quality materials in their design. There is insufficient detail as to how this can be measured and applied for decision makers to apply this transparently and consistently.</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 7.6 (now 6.6) to add to the first sentence that making use of good quality materials will help in this regard.'</p>
	<p>Paragraphs 7.9 and 7.10 include the definition of all new homes to include the C3 element of sheltered homes and extra care facilities and as such consider that this already serves a purpose of addressing a shortfall in supply. It is not appropriate for these schemes to deliver on site affordable housing, instead these should be off-site.</p>	<p>Other evidence around viability indicates that an affordable homes contribution from this type of development in sheltered and extra-care accommodation is not recommended. Delete second part of paragraph 7.10 (now 7.10) which states' including sheltered and extra care housing for older people.'</p>
	<p>Paragraph 7.20 Housing Mix and Type - Setting the presumption in favour of 2-3 bedroom homes is not appropriate and contradicts national policy in respect of sustainable development, to meet development needs, reduces the flexibility of the Local Plan to adapt to rapid change, and undermines the positive approach of SD1 to take a positive approach that reflects the presumptions in favour of market conditions and drivers. Suggests that the SHMA (2016) is now out of date, and the market will continue to change over the lifetime of the plan.</p>	<p>The guidance given in paragraphs 7.19 – 7.22 reflects the approach in the Local Plan around housing mix and tenure and refers not only to the SHMA, but to the fact that 'there may be other acceptable sources of evidence'. Although the Council's preferred mix is given in Table 2, paragraph 7.20 (renumbered as paragraph 6.20) states that this is a starting point for negotiation and consideration of planning applications. Paragraph 7.21 (now 7.21) suggests that other evidentiary documents can be submitted in support of planning applications. It considered that the approach in those paragraphs allows for further information to be submitted including where an applicant is of the view that the SHMA is 'out of date'. No proposed change.</p>
	<p>Paragraph 7.27 and 7.28 Land Transfer and Delivery Triggers questions how a larger site with phases how the triggers can be applied – can the triggers be applied to each phase?</p>	<p>Agree. Amend the final sentence in paragraph 7.28 to include reference to phasing as another circumstance or influence which lead to a variation in triggers.</p>
	<p>Paragraph 7.36 Land Transfer and Site Services - the requirement to transfer no more than 25% of market homes be completed prior to transfer part of the site to a Provider. It is asserted that this is too restrictive and offers no flexibility in the deliverability of a site and is</p>	<p>Agree and give further flexibility by amending paragraph 7.36 (renumbered as paragraph 6.36) to allow flexibility by discussion and agreement of triggers, where required.</p>

	inappropriate to secure transfer of land for affordable housing.	
	Paragraph 11.3 requires that a Viability Assessment be submitted at the time of the application, however there may be instances where one is required at a later stage. Request flexibility to allow for these instances.	Agree and amend paragraph 11.3 (now 10.3) to provide flexibility to allow viability evidence to be submitted at later stages of the planning application determination process.'
	Paragraph 11.4 sets out that the Council will refuse to consider a Viability Assessment is an applicant does not provide good reason as to why it should remain confidential. Queries the legal basis is for this approach.	Agree that a less prescriptive approach would be better suited, it would introduce flexibility whilst providing for the submission of the requisite viability information. Amend paragraph 11.3 (now 10.3) to allow for discussion and agreement around commercially sensitive information and for the applicant to submit a redacted version of viability evidence. Delete the final sentence which states that 'The Council may refuse to consider a Viability Assessment if an applicant insists upon its remaining confidential without good reason.'
	Application of the Optional Standards – Queries what framework is there for decision makers to follow.	For clarity addition of word 'all' to first sentence of paragraph 13.5 (now 12.5) so this requirement applies to all new homes. Redraft section to include make clear expectations and flexibilities in respect of engagement and information, including reference to Appendix B1 Housing Statement.
Nik Milnes/Community Homes Tees Valley	Paragraph 15.17 considers the support for Community Led Housing within Self-Build and Custom Build Housing to be positive. Suggests that Community Led Housing (CLH) be considered independently as an approach and a choice to delivering affordable housing. Also, that CLH could be the subject of a separate SPD, and within the SPD and can set out clearly what is required of CLH projects in order to increase the chances of obtaining planning permission.	The Council supports CLH and can assist groups in their submissions for those homes. However, it is not a matter that the Council considers requires specialist tailored guidance in this SPD or as a separate matter. No proposed change.

SPD2: Householder Extensions and Alterations

Person/Organisation	Comment	Council Response
Matt Verlander/Avison Young on behalf of National Grid	No comments	Noted

Carole Whitehead/Eggescliffe and Eggescliffe Parish Council	Section 2: Design Principles -The photographs in this section seem to be superfluous to requirements and potentially misleading as no captions are provided to make it clear whether they are good or bad examples or why.	The photographs are contextual and are intended to illustrate general good principles.
Carla Wright/Natural England	No comments	Noted
Emma Sharpe/Historic England	No comments	Noted
Caitlin Newby/Environment Agency	<p>The SPD sets out the General Design Principles expected of householder proposals. We consider this should more closely relate to policy SD5 of the Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council Local Plan (2019) as the overarching document. Policy SD5 seeks to meet the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change.</p> <p>We consider the approach taken in this document to encourage applicants to explore constraints is positive. However, it would be beneficial if this document encouraged applicants to determine the flood risk of their site and if any part of their curtilage lies in Flood Zones 2 or 3.</p> <p>We direct Local Planning Authorities to apply our Flood Risk Standing Advice in respect to minor development as we would not normally comment on these types of proposals. You can read the flood risk standing advice here: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessment-standing-advice#standing-advice-for-vulnerable-developments</p> <p>Where the proposal is for a vulnerable development, which for householder extensions is likely to be the case, the planning application should consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surface Water Management • Access and Evacuation • Floor Levels 	A sentence will be added to the introduction section to ensure that all constraints, including flood risk, are checked by the homeowner.
Chris Ratliff/Sembcorp Energy UK	No comments	Noted

Appendix C - Community Impact Assessment – Update following Consultation Incorporating Proposed Amendments

1. The Community Impact Assessment which informed the preparation of the draft SPDs did not identify inequalities that required a major change to the documents for them to proceed to Consultation. It set out that the wide ranging evidential and consultation activities in the preparation and subsequent adoption of the parent policies in the Local Plan, the consultation and engagement in respect of the SPDs, also led to conclusion that the Council does not consider that the SPDs would unlawfully discriminate against any group or individual, or provide the grounds for such discrimination. Furthermore, at that stage, it reported that the Council considered that it had demonstrated 'due regards' across all protected characteristics.
2. A full CIA at this stage would require a five-stage process which involves 1. Screening, 2. Scoping, 3. Consideration of Data and Information, 4. Assessment and 5. Reviewing and Scrutinising the Impact. As the previous stages are unchanged from originally drafted, it is considered that to proceed to adoption of the documents, application of only Stages 4 and 5 is required.
3. Following public consultation and publicity, in the light of the responses received, the Council proposes a number of amendments to those documents, and they are listed at Appendix B above. Tables 1 and 2 below set out the proposed amendments and the assessment of the likely impacts of those changes to the SPD against Protected Characteristic in Tables 1 and 2 below.

Addendum Stage 4: Assessment

Table 1 – SPD No 1 Housing

Schedule of Comments, Council Response/Proposed Change and Likely Impact of against Protected Characteristic

SPD1: Housing		
Person/Organisation	Council Response and Proposed Change	Likely Impact of against Protected Characteristic*
Matt Verlander/Avison Young on behalf of National Grid	Noted.	N/A
Cllr Louise Baldock/Stockton on Tees	The percentages for accessible and adaptable home are set by Local Plan policy H4. However, developers can be encouraged to provide	No evidence that the change to the SPD effected by this response will

SPD1: Housing		
Person/Organisation	Council Response and Proposed Change	Likely Impact of against Protected Characteristic*
Borough Council	for a higher proportion. A sentence will be added setting out that the percentages are not a maximum and developers can provide more.	have a particular impact on people with a protected characteristic.
Carla Wright/Natural England	Noted	N/A
Emma Sharpe/Historic England	Noted	N/A
Richard Holland/Persimmon	The approach of the SPD reflects point 9 b. of policy H4. Point 9 also sets out those instances where considerations might indicate a deviation from the Standards, and that includes site viability. There is no justification to include the suggested sentence. No proposed change.	N/A
Caitlin Newby/Environment Agency	Noted	N/A
Paul Mackings/Cameron Hall	The approach in the SPD reflects adopted Policy H4.6, which states that where off-site affordable housing or a commuted sum is considered acceptable, the amount will be equivalent in value to that which would have been viable if the provision was made on-site and calculated with regard to Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document 8 and any successor. Viability matters are fully informed by formal assessment and subsequent negotiations are carried out on a case by case basis. For clarity amend paragraph 8.1 to state that the value of market homes is equivalent to that of homes on development site.	No evidence that the change to the SPD effected by this response will have a particular impact on people with a protected characteristic.
Chris Ratcliff/Sembcorp	Appendix B4 sets out the matters that a Viability Assessment is expected to address but is not intended to be exhaustive. Where supporting infrastructure or remediation has an impact on viability and deliverability, the Council expects that element to form part of assessment and discussions. No proposed change.	N/A
	Noted. However, the Council considers that this information is of use to those with an interest in affordable homes. Preference for cessation of developer's obligation is noted. No proposed change.	
Tetlow King Planning/Rentplus UK Ltd	The definition of affordable homes within the Glossary to the SPD reflects the four definitions in the Framework. The Council has	N/A

SPD1: Housing		
Person/Organisation	Council Response and Proposed Change	Likely Impact of against Protected Characteristic*
	defined Intermediate Tenure as homes for sale and rent provided above social rent, and that these can be shared equity [shared ownership and equity loans, other low-cost homes for sale and intermediate rent, but not affordable rented housing. Furthermore, the definition goes on to say that the intermediate tenures MUST fit within the definition of affordable housing. No proposed change.	
	The intent of paragraph 7.15 onwards is not preclude entirely other products. Any alternatives to the Council's preferences however should be justified in evidence of how that product would meet and be secured to meet a local affordable housing need. No proposed change.	N/A
	The intent of paragraph 7.15 onwards is not preclude entirely other products. Any alternatives to the Council's preferences however should be justified in evidence of how that product would meet and be secured to meet a local affordable housing need. No proposed change.	N/A
Chris Smith/Lichfields on behalf of Story Homes	Paragraph 7.8 does not require NDSS but supports and encourages attainment of those standards. Comments regarding viability are noted. No proposed change.	N/A
	The intent of paragraph 7.15 onwards is not preclude entirely other products. Any alternatives to the Council's preferences however should be justified in evidence of how that product would address and be secured to meet a local affordable housing need. There is no requirement for 'robust evidence' in this instance, but robust procedures to ensure that the homes are available to those in need. The advice in paragraph 7.18 reflects the Council's view that the housing market has not changed sufficiently to dismiss the findings of the SHMA. Paragraph Appendix B1 Housing Statement (rather than the Affordable Housing Statement) requires information regarding house tenures and types and how this reflects local needs and demands. No proposed change.	N/A
	Paragraphs 7.18 and 7.19 around housing mix and tenure refers to evidence in the SHMA, but paragraph 7.21 goes on to say that an applicant can provide other evidentiary documents and surveys to	N/A

SPD1: Housing		
Person/Organisation	Council Response and Proposed Change	Likely Impact of against Protected Characteristic*
	support products. It is considered that there is enough flex to allow for consideration and provision of alternatives. No proposed change.	
	The guidance given in paragraphs 7.19 – 7.22 reflects the approach in the Local Plan around housing mix and tenure and refers not only to the SHMA, but to the fact that ‘there may be other acceptable sources of evidence’. Although the Council’s preferred mix is given in Table 2, paragraph 7.20 states that this is a starting point for negotiation and consideration of planning applications. Paragraph 7.21 suggests that other evidentiary documents can be submitted in support of planning applications. It considered that the approach in those paragraphs allows for further information to be submitted including where an applicant is of the view that the SHMA is ‘out of date’. No proposed change.	N/A
	Agree and revise bullet points in Paragraph 7.30 to reflect point 5 of Policy H4.	No evidence that the change to the SPD effected by this response will have a particular impact on people with a protected characteristic.
	The basis of the approach is paragraph 11.4 is to agree those matters that can be released to the public and those which are commercially sensitive. Agree that a less prescriptive approach would be appropriate. Amend paragraph 11.4 to require agreement (with the Council) of sensitive information and for applicants to supply, for publication a redacted version of viability evidence.	No evidence that the change to the SPD effected by this response will have a particular impact on people with a protected characteristic
	Comment is noted but disagree and the reference to M4(1) is retained for completeness. No proposed change.	N/A
Oliver Lloyd/Gladman	Noted. The SPD has not been drafted with the intention of setting new policy.	N/A
	Noted and Paragraph 5.11 leads on this matter. Agree that there may be instances where this is not possible, and this should be reflected in the paragraph. Amend relevant sentence to allow flexibility in this regard.	No evidence that the change to the SPD effected by this response will have a particular impact on people with a protected characteristic
	Agree and amend sentence in paragraph 5.12 to refer to supplying the details of Registered Providers where appropriate	No evidence that the change to the SPD effected by this response will

SPD1: Housing		
Person/Organisation	Council Response and Proposed Change	Likely Impact of against Protected Characteristic*
	and available.	have a particular impact on people with a protected characteristic
	Paragraph 7.3 and Appendix B2 sets out that an AHS should be based on the approach and information requirements set out in the SPD and the Appendix, as appropriate. This gives flexibility around the detail required for determination based on the type of application. For clarity, insert sentence in Paragraph 7.3 to allow for flexibility in the range and type of information to be submitted in each instance.	No evidence that the change to the SPD effected by this response will have a particular impact on people with a protected characteristic
	Amend paragraph 7.6 to add to the first sentence that making use of good quality materials will help in this regard.'	No evidence that the change to the SPD effected by this response will have a particular impact on people with a protected characteristic
	Other evidence around viability indicates that an affordable homes contribution from this type of development in sheltered and extra-care accommodation is not recommended. Delete second part of paragraph 7.10 which states' including sheltered and extra care housing for older people.'	No evidence that the change to the SPD effected by this response will have a particular impact on people with a protected characteristic
	The guidance given in paragraphs 7.19 – 7.22 reflects the approach in the Local Plan around housing mix and tenure and refers not only to the SHMA, but to the fact that 'there may be other acceptable sources of evidence'. Although the Council's preferred mix is given in Table 2, paragraph 7.20 states that this is a starting point for negotiation and consideration of planning applications. Paragraph 7.21 suggests that other evidentiary documents can be submitted in support of planning applications. It considered that the approach in those paragraphs allows for further information to be submitted including where an applicant is of the view that the SHMA is 'out of date'. No proposed change.	N/A
	Agree. Amend the final sentence in paragraph 7.28 to include reference to phasing as another circumstance or influence which lead to a variation in triggers.	No evidence that the change to the SPD effected by this response will have a particular impact on people with a protected characteristic
	Agree and give further flexibility by amending paragraph 7.36 to	No evidence that the change to the

SPD1: Housing		
Person/Organisation	Council Response and Proposed Change	Likely Impact of against Protected Characteristic*
	allow flexibility by discussion and agreement of triggers, where required.	SPD effected by this response will have a particular impact on people with a protected characteristic
	Agree and amend paragraph 11.3 to provide flexibility to allow viability evidence to be submitted at later stages of the planning application determination process.'	No evidence that the change to the SPD effected by this response will have a particular impact on people with a protected characteristic
	Agree that a less prescriptive approach would be better suited, it would introduce flexibility whilst providing for the submission of the requisite viability information. Amend paragraph 11.3 to allow for discussion and agreement around commercially sensitive information and for the applicant to submit a redacted version of viability evidence. Delete the final sentence which states that 'The Council may refuse to consider a Viability Assessment if an applicant insists upon its remaining confidential without good reason.'	No evidence that the change to the SPD effected by this response will have a particular impact on people with a protected characteristic
	For clarity addition of word 'all' to first sentence of paragraph 13.5 so this requirement applies to all new homes. Redraft section to include make clear expectations and flexibilities in respect of engagement and information, including reference to Appendix B1 Housing Statement.	No evidence that the change to the SPD effected by this response will have a particular impact on people with a protected characteristic
Nik Milnes/Community Homes Tees Valley	The Council supports CLH and can assist groups in their submissions for those homes. However, it is not a matter that the Council considers requires specialist tailored guidance in this SPD or as a separate matter. No proposed change.	N/A

*Protected Characteristic is any of the following: Age, Disability, Gender Reassignment, Marriage and Civil Partnership, Pregnancy and Maternity, Race, Religion or Belief, Sex, Sexual Orientation, Ex-Service Personnel or Community Cohesion.

Stage 4: Assessment

**Table 2 – SPD No 2 Householder Extensions and Alterations
Schedule of Comments, Council Response/Proposed Change and Likely Impact of against Protected Characteristic**

SPD2: Householder Extensions and Alterations

Person/Organisation	Council Response	Likely Impact of against all Protected Characteristic*
Matt Verlander/Avison Young on behalf of National Grid	Noted	N/A
Carole Whitehead/Eggescliffe and Eggescliffe Parish Council	The photographs are contextual and are intended to illustrate general good principles.	N/A
Carla Wright/Natural England	Noted	N/A
Emma Sharpe/Historic England	Noted	N/A
Caitlin Newby/Environment Agency	A sentence will be added to the introduction section to ensure that all constraints, including flood risk, are checked by the homeowner.	No evidence that the change to the SPD effected by this response will have a particular impact on people with a protected characteristic.
Chris Ratliff/Sembcorp Energy UK	Noted	N/A

*Protected Characteristic is any of the following: Age, Disability, Gender Reassignment, Marriage and Civil Partnership, Pregnancy and Maternity, Race, Religion or Belief, Sex, Sexual Orientation, Ex-Service Personnel or Community Cohesion.

4. As concluded in Stage 5 to the draft SPDs, it is considered that as amended they will continue to have the potential to have an impact on all those who live and work in the Borough regardless of age, disability or other protected characteristics. The SPDs are written for all members of the community and not for specific individuals or groups. No potentially adverse impacts have been identified for any particular group. Whilst no disproportionate positive impact is likely to arise as a result of the Householder Extensions and Alterations SPD, as identified in the assessment of the draft version of the Housing SPD, that SPD will continue to have a likely positive impact on those members of community with age and disability and Ex-Service Personnel and for Community Cohesion characteristics. If the SPDs are not adopted by the Council, there could be adverse impacts on the living opportunities and conditions of any/all groups.

Addendum Stage 5 Reviewing and Scrutinising the Impact

What plans do you have in place to monitor the impact of the proposals once they have been implemented? (The full impact of the decision may only be known after the proposals have been implemented).

5. The effectiveness of the SPD will be monitored alongside the relevant Local Plan policies and reviewed on an annual basis.

What course of action does this CIA suggest you take? More than one of the following may apply.

- 6.
- Outcome 1: No major change required. The CIA has not identified any potential for discrimination or adverse impact and all opportunities to promote equality have been taken.
 - Outcome 2: Adjust the policy to remove barriers identified by the CIA or better promote equality. Are you satisfied that the proposed adjustments will remove the barriers identified? (Complete action plan).
 - Outcome 3: Continue the policy despite potential for adverse impact or missed opportunities to promote equality identified. You will need to ensure that the CIA clearly sets out the justifications for continuing with it. You should consider whether there are sufficient plans to reduce the negative impact and/or plans to monitor the actual impact (see questions below). (Complete action plan).
 - Outcome 4: Stop and rethink the policy when the CIA shows actual or potential unlawful discrimination. (Complete action plan).

Action Plan and Timetable for Implementation

7. It is considered that **Outcome 1** is applicable, and an Action Plan is not required. This is because the CIA update does not identify inequalities that require a major change to the SPDs following the proposed amendments in order to proceed to Adoption. The wide ranging evidential and consultation activities in the preparation and subsequent adoption of the parent policies in the Local Plan, the consultation and engagement in respect of the SPDs, means that the Council do not consider that the SPDs will unlawfully discriminate against any group or individual, or provide the grounds for such discrimination. Furthermore, it is considered that the Council has demonstrated 'due regards' across all protected characteristics.
8. The SPDs will be monitored alongside the relevant policies in the Local Plan, where progress will be reported in the Council's Authority Monitoring Report. Where changes to the Local Plan policies are indicated, the SPD will be reviewed and updated accordingly.

Review of The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004

Part 9 Determination of Likely Significant Environmental Effects

Determination and Statement of Reasons under Part 9 (1) and (3)

1. In the assessment undertaken for these purposes at Consultation Draft stage, the Council determined at Stage 1 of the Screening Process that SEA is relevant to the SPDs, and at Stage 2 that the Housing SPD and Householder Extensions and Alterations SPD are unlikely to cause significant environmental effects in their application to decision taking, particularly as the parent policies in the adopted Stockton on Tees Local Plan have been subject to rigorous assessment in this respect both in preparation and in their final form through formal Examination in Public. In view of the assessment at Stage 2, the Council's preliminary opinion at Stage 3 was that an Environmental Report would not be required.
2. Following responses which confirmed the Council's conclusions at Stage 3, from the 'Consultation Bodies', that is Natural England, the Environment Agency and internal verification following Historic England's inability to respond, the Council determined that an environmental assessment of the SPDs was not required.
3. Since the proposed changes to each document arising from the consultation has not changed the scope and purpose of the SPDs and (as amended) neither document makes 'new' policy or allocates or establishes policies for the development of sites or areas of the Borough, it is considered that the initial determination is still valid.

Other Social, Economic and Environmental Assessments

4. In light of the conclusions in paragraph 3 above, and as concluded in the initial Strategic Environmental Assessment Consultation Screening Report document, it remains the Council's view that neither Sustainability Assessment or Habitats Regulations Assessment is required.

Appendix D – List of Organisations

Accent Group
Adlington Planning Team
AECOM
Airport Operators Association
Anchor Trust
Appletons Chartered Surveyors
Arcus Consultancy Services Ltd (Planning Division)
Arriva
Arup
Atisha Buddhist Centre
Augean PLC
Avant Homes (North East)
Avison Young
Baines Goldston
Bangladeshi Muslim Welfare Association
Banks Developments Ltd
Baptist Union of Great Britain
Barclays Bank C/O Shire Consulting
Barratt David Wilson Homes
Barratt Homes
Barton Willmore (on behalf of Church Comissioners)
Barton Willmore LLP
Bede Sixth Form College
Bellway Homes
Big Tree Planning Ltd
Billingham Town Council
Bishopton Parish Council
Blackett Hart and Pratt
BNP Paribas
BOC Gases
British Geological Survey
British Toilet Association
BT Group plc
BTCV

Building Design Consultant
Building Research Establishment
Business & Resident Action Group - Norton High Street
Cameron Hall Developments c/o England and Lyle Ltd
Campaign for Real Ale
Canals and Rivers Trust
Carlton Parish Council
Carter Jonas LLP
Carter Jonas LLP on behalf of DG Dale and Sons
Castlegate Shopping Centre
Catalyst
Caterpillar Stockton
CB Richard Ellis Ltd
CH2M (Highways England)
Charles Church
Childrens Society
Chris Thomas Ltd
Church Commissioners
Churchill Retirement Living
Civil Aviation Authority
CLA North
Cleveland Fire Brigade
Cleveland Police Headquarters
Coal Authority
Coast & County Housing
Colliers International
Community Welfare Trust
Conoco Phillips Petroleum Co. UK Ltd
Concept Town Planning Ltd
Connect Property North East Ltd
ConocoPhillips Petroleum Company UK Ltd
Cooperative Group
Council for British Archaeology
Countryside Properties
Cowpen Bewley Residents Association

CPRE
Crathorne Parish Council
CRC- Churches Regional Commission in the North East
Crown Estate Office
Cushman and Wakefield
Dalton Warner Davis Chartered Surveyors
Dalton Warner Davis Chartered Surveyors on behalf of Wellington 2004 Estate Company
Darlington Borough Council
David Kitchen Associates
Davis Planning Partnership
DEFRA
Deloitte
Deloitte Real Estate
Department for Business Innovation and Skills
Department for Transport
Design Council
Dodds Brown
DPDS Consulting Group
DPP (Newcastle)
DPP Planning
DTZ
Durham County Council
Durham University
Eaglescliffe Preservation Action Group
East and West Newbiggin Parish Meeting
Education Funding Agency
EE
Egglecliffe & Eaglescliffe Parish Council
Egglecliffe Youth Group
ELG Planning
Elwick Parish Council
Emery Planning
Endeavour Housing Association
Endeavour Partnership
Environment Agency
Esh Developments

Estate Directorate, Ministry of Justice	Hellens Group	KLR Planning Ltd
Fairhurst	Highways England	KLR Planning Ltd (on behalf of GMI
Federation of Small Businesses	Highways England - Northumberland &	Developments)
FFT Planning	Durham	Knight Frank LLP
Fields in Trust	Highways England Tees Valley	KT Associates
Firstplan	Highways England Tyne & Wear	Lafarge Aggregates Ltd
Fordy Marshall	Hilton Parish Council	Lambert Smith Hampton
Forest Enterprise	Hindu Culture Centre	Letch Lane Residents
Forestry Commission (Morpeth)	Historic England	Lexington Communications
Forestry Commisstion (County Durham)	Historic Towns Forum	Lichfields
Freight Transport Association	HJ Banks & Co Limited	Limes Developments
Friends of Tees Heritage Park	Hobson 7 Smith, Builders	Local clinical commissioning group
Friends of the Darlington Stockton Railway	Home Builders Federation	Long Newton Parish Council
Friends of the Earth - Middlesbrough & Redcar	Home Group	Lovell Johns
Garden History Society	Home Office	Lovells
Gentoo Homes	Homes England	Maltby Northern Edge Resident's Group
Geoplan Ltd	How Planning	Maltby Parish Council
George F White	Husband and Brown Limited	Marine Management Organisation
Gerald Eve LLP	Ian Derby Partnership	Marrons Planning
Girsby Parish Council	Indigo Planning	Matthew Trotter & Miller Architects
GL Hearn Property Consultants	Industry Nature Conservation Association	McGough Planning
Gladman Developments	INEOS Chlor Vinyls Ltd	Metropolis PD
GO Northern	Ingleby Barwick Town Council	Michael Mealing (Planning)
Great Stainton Parish Meeting	Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority	Middlesbrough Borough Council
Greatham Parish Council	Inter Terminals	Middleton St George Parish Council
Greenergy Terminal Limited	Interserve Construction Limited	Miller Homes
Grindon and Thorpe Thewles Parish Council	Jayline Travel	Ministry of Defence
Groundwork Trust	Jeffrey Tarren & Associates	Montagu Evans LLP
Habiteg	JG Eaglescliffe (Holdings) Ltd	Mordon Parish Meeting
Hale	JigSaw Planning	Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners
Hambleton District Council	Jomast Developments	Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners on behalf of
Hanover Housing	Jon Tweddell Planning	Wynyard Estates
Hart Properties	JWPC Limited	National Farmers Union
Hartburn Residents Association	Karbon Homes	National Grid
Hartlepool Borough Council	Keepmoat	Natural England
Hartlepool Water	Kirklevington & Castle Leavington Parish	Network Rail
Health & Safety Executive	Council	Newby Parish Council
Hedley Planning Services	Kirklevington Property Co Ltd	Newton Bewley Parish Meeting

NFU
NG Bailey
NHS England North
NHS Hartlepool and Stockton-on-Tees Clinical
Commissioning Group
NHS Property Services Ltd
NHS Stockton - Public Health
North East Chamber of Commerce
North East Civic Trust
North East Community Forests
North Star Housing Group
North Tees Ltd
North Tees NHS Trust
North Yorkshire County Council
Northern Consortium of Housing
Northern Gas Networks Ltd
Northern Powergrid
Northumbria Garden Trust
Northumbrian Water Ltd
Norton Village Association
Npower Renewables
Ofcom
Office of Rail and Road
OFFICE OF THE DURHAM POLICE, CRIME
AND VICTIMS' COMMISSIONER
Office of the North Yorkshire Police and Crime
Commissioner
Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner
for Cleveland
Openreach
Oxbridge Residents Association
P&M Properties
PD Ports
Peacock and Smith
Peacock and Smith on behalf of Wm. Morrison
supermarkets
Persimmon Homes
Persimmon Homes Teesside

Philips Petroleum
Picton Parish Meeting
Places for People
Plainview Planning Ltd
PlanInfo
Planning Potential
Planning Prospects
Planning Team, Bond Dickinson
Planning Works Ltd
Planware Ltd
POLICE & CRIME COMMISSIONER FOR
CLEVELAND
Porta Planning
Preston Farm Developments
Preston on Tees Parish Council
Primeland Consultants Limited
Prism Planning
PX Group
Rae Watson Development Surveyors
Railway Housing Association
Ramblers Association, Stockton
Rapleys
Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council
Redmarshall Parish Council
RG&P LTD
RGB Ltd
Richard Burt Design
Road Haulage Association - Northern Office
Robert Halstead Chartered Surveyor
RPS Group Plc
RSPB
RSPB (Northern England Region)
Rudby Parish Council
Sabic UK Petrochemicals Ltd
Sadberge Parish Council
Saddington Taylor
Sanderson Weatherall on behalf of Lidl UK
Satnam Group

SAVE
Savills
School of Architecture, Planning & Landscape
Seamer Parish Council
Sedgefield Parish Council
Sembcorp
Shri Guru Nanak Gurdwara and Sikh
Community Centre
Shuttleworth Picknett & Associates LLP
Signet Newcastle
Signet Planning
Sita UK
Smiths Gore
Society for the Promotion and Advancement of
Romany Culture
Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings
(SPAB)
Solutions Northern
South Tees Mayoral Development Corporation
Southlands Management Ltd
sp&architects
Spawforths
Sport England
SSA Planning Limited
SSA Planning Limited (on behalf of KFC Ltd)
St James's Street Property Management
St Modwen
Stagecarriage
Stagecoach Transit
Stainton and Thornton Parish Council
Stephenson Halliday
Steve Hesmondhaigh & Associates
Stewart Ross Association
Stillington & Whitton Parish Council
Stockton Business Forum
Stockton Renaissance
Stockton Residents' Association
Stockton Riverside College

Stockton Sixth Form College
Stockton Town Pastors
Story Homes
Taylor Wimpey
Tees and Hartlepool Port Authority Ltd.
Tees Archaeology
Tees East and North Yorkshire Ambulance
NHS Trust
Tees Valley Combined Authority
Tees Valley Local Access Forum
Tees Valley Nature Partnership
Tees Valley Rural Community Council
Tees Valley Wildlife Trust
Teesside Humanist Society
Teesside International Airport
Tesni Properties Limited
TETLOW KING PLANNING
The Ancient Monuments Society
The Co-operative Group
The Council for British Archaeology
The Energy Workshop
The Georgian Group
The Gypsy Council UK Office
The National Federation of Gypsy Liaison
Groups
The Planning Bureau Ltd
The Sirius Group
The Theatres Trust
The Twentieth Century Society
The Victorian Society
The Woodland Trust
Thirteen Group
Thomas Eggar LLP on behalf of Asda Stores
Ltd
Thornaby Town Council
Thoroughbred Homes Ltd
Thorpe Thewles Residents Association
Three

Tithe Barn Land
TM Urban Developments
Tomlinson Hall
Transco
Traveller Law Reform Coalition
Turley Associates
Turley Associates on behalf of Tees Valley
Airport
U.K Land Estates
University of Durham
Vernon and Co
Viewpoint
Virgin Media
Vodafone and O2
Vopak
Ward Hadaway
Wardell Armstrong
Wellington 2004 Estate Company
Wellington Square Shopping Centre
Westbury Mosque
White Young Green Planning
Williams Gallagher
Wolviston Parish Council
Wood PLC
Woodland Trust
Woodsyde, Thorntree farm
Worsall Parish Council
Wright Construction (Durham) Ltd.
Wyevale Garden Centres Ltd
WYG
Wynyard Parish Council
Wynyard Park
Wynyard Residents Association
Yarm and Willie Flats Residents Group
Yarm Chamber of Trade
Yarm Civic Society
Yarm Residents Group
Yarm Town Council

York Diocesan Society
Yorkshire Gardens Trust
Zero Waste Ltd